

**TESTIMONY  
REPRESENTATIVE KEN CALVERT  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL ECONOMIC GROWTH,  
NATURAL RESOURCES, AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT  
April 23, 1998**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me to testify today and let me commend you for holding this timely hearing. At a time of unparalleled prosperity, the American people need to know if they should put the nation's economy at risk over a theory on what the world's climate will be 100 years from now.

By shedding light on the potential impact of the Kyoto Protocol on "real people," as you have ably described it, you can help pierce the "fog machine" set up by Vice President Gore and others on this issue.

At the outset, I should point out that the Energy and Environment Subcommittee, which I chair, has given strong bipartisan support to climate change research by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This research has produced great advances in forecasting weather phenomena such as El Nino. No one should confuse skepticism about the Kyoto Protocol with support for long term climate change research.

As you know, our Subcommittee held three "Countdown to Kyoto" hearings before the December conference. I attended the conference as a member of the House delegation.

Following the conference, Science Committee Chairman Jim Sensenbrenner, who had led the delegation, held three “Road From Kyoto” hearings.

I would like to share with you a little of what we learned at those hearings, in particular as it bears on the topic before you today.

First, as to the science, it is clear there is no consensus on precisely how or if increases in greenhouse gas emissions will affect the world’s climate.

Scientists continue to speak out despite severe pressure from the Administration to tow the line. For example, the Secretary of the Interior implied recently that any scientist who disagreed with him on global warming was “un-American.”

Nevertheless, just two weeks ago, at the National Hurricane Conference in Virginia, Neil Frank, a familiar face from his days as Director of the National Hurricane Center in Miami, said that “climate change has nothing to do with carbon dioxide,” that “the atmosphere is too complex and the computers too slow to make long-term climate forecasts.”

Next, as to the economic effects. David Montgomery of Charles River Associates, a recognized expert on the economics of energy policy, told us he found the Administration claim that technologies will be deployed between now and 2010 that would reduce emissions sufficiently to meet the Kyoto mandate at no cost to be “extremely implausible.”

We heard Michael Buckner of the United Mine Workers say that independent economic studies they commissioned from DRI/McGraw Hill and the Economic Policy Institute showed reductions in greenhouse gases of the magnitude called for in the Protocol would result in “lost jobs, lost wages, higher energy prices and higher trade deficits that would create a perverse economic incentive for American companies to relocate their operations abroad.”

Dr. Jay Hakes, the Administrator of the Department of Energy’s own Energy Information Administration, testified the Kyoto Protocol would require a 31 percent reduction in carbon emissions from what could be expected around 2010. In a remarkably candid statement for an Administration official, Dr. Hakes went on to say that “it is unlikely the adjustments can be achieved without a significant price mechanism” and that any price mechanism selected would “slow somewhat the rate of economic growth.” Now, translating that into plain English, Hakes is saying that no matter how you look at it, implementing the Kyoto Protocol means higher energy prices that will hurt the economy.

Finally, let’s look at the end result. Even if you accept the Gore “apocalypse” theory of global warming, and even if you believe that the threat is so serious it is worth sacrificing our hard-won prosperity to meet it, we have an agreement that won’t work.

Again, just yesterday, the Energy Information Administration, in its 1998 International Energy Outlook, stated that “even if the parties to the Kyoto Protocol were able to achieve the proposed target reductions, worldwide emissions levels would continue to rise by 32 percent between 1990 and 2010.”

The Protocol does not include some of the fastest-growing countries in the world, including China. Domestically, it excludes whole groups of emissions, including Defense Department equipment and aircraft, which we now know to be one of the biggest emitters of greenhouse gases.

So, Mr. Chairman, who will the burden fall on? Why, our constituents, of course. Yours in Muncie and mine in Riverside. It is the Administration’s hope that resistance from the American people to imposing these burdens can be overcome by doomsday scenarios of apocalyptic floods and diseases and tactics designed to demonize the opposition.

So it is all the more important that hearings like this one continue to be held throughout the process and I look forward to learning more from the testimony today.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.